



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,697	08/30/2001	Armin Amrhein	A34463 (071308.0222)	9229

31625 7590 03/14/2006
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039

EXAMINER

CHANG, SUNRAY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/942,697	Applicant(s) AMRHEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Sunray Chang	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in responsive to the paper filed on January 23rd, 2006.

2. Claims 6 – 15 are presented for Continued Examination.

Claims 6 – 15 are rejected.

Claims 1 – 5 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 6 – 15 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steven J. Altschuler (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,971 and referred to as **Altschuler** hereinafter), and in view of Terrence L. Blevins (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,963 and referred to as Blevins hereinafter).

(**Altschuler** as set forth above generally discloses the basic inventions.)

Regarding independent claims 6 , 10 and 13 – 14,

Altschuler teaches,

- A method for the integrating a plurality of automation components in a uniform running level model of a respective runtime system (RTS) of an industrial controller (S); [Abstract, Col. 1, Lines 9 – 20, Col. 6, Line 67 – Col. 8, Line 4]
- a uniform configurable running model for a control task of the industrial controller which can be configured flexibly [Col. 3, Lines 38 – 43] wherein
- the running model receives a main clock and means for providing said main clock to said running model by **selecting one** of the clock sources from the group of clock sources consisting of an internal timer of the industrial controller, an internal timer of a communication bus, a clock source within an external device, and a clock source within a technological process. [a system clock utility, Col. 14, Line 51]

Examiner further explains, regarding computer programs, tasks, or software tools are all running in computer system based on the clock of the computer system.

Altschuler does not teach an industrial controller.

Blevins teaches an industrial controller [Col. 1, Lines 5 – 8, Abstract], for the purpose of using of advanced control blocks.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Altschuler** to include "an industrial controller", for the purpose of using of advanced control blocks.

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 11,

Altschuler teaches,

- prioritizing the system and user level tasks. [Col. 13, Lines 21 – 36]

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 12,

Altschuler teaches,

- user level tasks are loaded into the at least one user level. [Col. 7, Lines 30 – 38]

Regarding dependent claims 9 and 15,

Altschuler teaches,

- programmed accessing overall functionality from the user programs.

Altschuler does not teach a controller.

Blevins teaches an industrial controller [Col. 1, Lines 5 – 8, Abstract], for the purpose of using of advanced control blocks.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Altschuler** to include "an industrial controller", for the purpose of using of advanced control blocks.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Applicants' argument regarding "the independent claims define that the main clock source is selected from a plurality of clock sources, the variety of clock sources that can be selected must include at least "an internal timer of the industrial controller, an internal timer of a communication bus, a clock source within an external device, and a clock source within a technological process" (Page 3, lines 6 – 10) is disagreed with. Applicants are not even claiming "selecting one of the clock sources from the group of clock sources consisting of: an internal timer of the industrial controller, an internal timer of a communication bus, a clock source within an external device, and a clock source within a technological process", the amendment filed November 17th, 2005 deleted this limitation. **Altschuler** teaches a system clock utility [Col. 14, Line 51] is a clock source within an external device or a clock source within a technological process, one with ordinary skill in the art would know that all computer system program, task, software tools are running in computer systems based on the clock signals of the system.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 09/942,697

Art Unit: 2121

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-746-3506.

Sunray Chang
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2121
Technology Center 2100
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

March 8, 2006



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600